

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Examiner Vinh and the undersigned attorney, Allen Inks, conducted an interview by telephone on April 22, 2010. During the interview, the requirement that the Examiner consider every element of the claims was discussed, and the admissions of the Examiner in the preceding Office Action that "it is true that the lack of bonding in the tube cavity 802 [of Tadigadapa] is a result of the physical separation of the coated surfaces", and "it is true that the lack of bonding in the tube cavity 56 [of Khuri-Yakub] is a result of the physical separation of the coated surfaces" were discussed in light of limitations of the non-allowed independent claims (Claims 1 and 21) that "the coating being effective to prevent ... bonding" (Claim 1) and "the coating prevents ...bonding" (Claim 21). Agreement was reached that the Examiner had failed to properly address all the limitations of the claims, and that Applicant would submit a formal response for consideration. This submission is that formal response.